

# **EXHIBIT I**

1                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
                    NORTHERNDISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
4 Plaintiff,

5 and

6 OSAGE MINERALS COUNCIL,

7 Intervenor-Plaintiff,

8 vs. Case No. 14-CV-704-GFK-JFJ

9 OSAGE WIND, LLC;  
ENEL KANSAS, LLC; and  
10 ENEL GREEN POWER NORTH  
AMERICA, INC.,

Defendants.

13 VIDEO ZOOM DEPOSITION OF JOHN H. PFAHL  
TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF  
14 ON MARCH 10, 2021, BEGINNING AT 10:01 A.M.  
IN TULSA, OKLAHOMA

17 APPEARANCES

18 On behalf of the PLAINTIFF:

19 Cathryn D. McClanahan  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
20 UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
Northern District of Oklahoma  
21 110 W. 7th St., Suite 300  
Tulsa, OK 74119  
22 (918) 382-2700  
cathy.mcclanahan@usdoj.gov

Christina Watson, Paralegal  
24 Michelle Hammock, Paralegal

25 REPORTED BY: SUSAN K. McGUIRE, CSR, RPR

<p>Page 2</p> <p>1 Of counsel for the Plaintiff:</p> <p>2 Charles R. Babst, Jr. Senior Attorney Tulsa Field Solicitor's Office U.S. Department of the Interior 7096 East 33rd Street Tulsa, OK 74145 (918) 669-7902</p> <p>6 On behalf of the DEFENDANTS:</p> <p>7 Ryan A. Ray NORMAN WOHLGEMUTH, CHANDLER JETER, BARNETT &amp; RAY, P.C. 401 S. Boston Ave. 2900 Mid-Continent Tower Tulsa, OK 74103 (918) 583-7571 rar@nwcjlaw.com</p> <p>12 Sarah M. Stevenson Dominic A. Martinez MODRALL SPERLING, ROEHL, HARRIS &amp; SISK, P.A. 500 Fourth St. NW, Suite 1000 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103 (505) 848-1800 sarah.stevenson@modrall.com dam@modrall.com</p> <p>17 On behalf of the INTERVENOR-PLAINTIFF:</p> <p>18 Mary Kathryn Nagle Wilson K. Pipestem Jennifer Baker PIPESTEM &amp; NAGLE, P.C. 401 S. Boston Ave., Suite 2200 Tulsa, OK 74103 (918) 936-4705 mknagle@pipestemlaw.com wkpipestem@pipestemlaw.com jbaker@pipestemlaw.com</p> <p>23 Megan Beauregard Associate General Counsel Enel Green Power North America</p> <p>25 ALSO PRESENT: Gabe Pack, Videographer</p>	<p>Page 4</p> <p>1 VIDEOGRAPHER: This is a videotaped 2 deposition of John Pfahl, in the matter of the United 3 States and Osage Minerals Council versus Osage Wind, 4 on March 10th, 2021. We are on the record at 10:01 5 a.m.</p> <p>6 Will Counsel please state your appearances 7 for the record.</p> <p>8 MS. McCLANAHAN: I'll start. I'm Cathy 9 McClanahan for the United States. I have Charles 10 Babst here, as well, of counsel. He's with the 11 Department of Interior.</p> <p>12 MS. NAGLE: Mary Kathryn Nagle for the Osage 13 Minerals Council, Intervenor-Plaintiff. With me I 14 also have my partner, Wilson Pipestem, from Pipestem 15 Law, as well as Jennifer Baker from Pipestem Law.</p> <p>16 MR. RAY: Good morning. Ryan Ray for all 17 defendants, Osage Wind, LLC; Enel Green Power, North 18 America, Incorporated; and Enel Kansas, LLC.</p> <p>19 THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Pfahl -- 20 MS. STEVENSON: This is Sarah Stevenson, I'm 21 also here for defendants, along with my colleague, 22 Dominic Martinez.</p> <p>23 VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter will now 24 swear in the witness. 25 * * * * *</p>
<p>Page 3</p> <p>1 CONTENTS</p> <p>2 Page</p> <p>3 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. McCLANAHAN 5</p> <p>4 CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. NAGLE 129</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 EXHIBITS</p> <p>7 Exhibit Page</p> <p>8 1 SRK Consulting Report 12 2 2011 RMT Report 25 9 3 Tribal Resolution 28 4 Westlaw 25 CFR 214.10 32 10 5 Osage Wind 12246 Purchase Order 39 6 Change Order 59 11 7 Tenth Circuit Opinion 60 8 Email 5-15-14 156 12 9 Article 202 10 Geological Survey 211</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 STIPULATIONS</p> <p>15 It is stipulated that the deposition of 16 JOHN H. PFAHL may be taken on MARCH 10, 2021, pursuant 17 to agreement and in accordance with the Federal Rules 18 of Civil Procedure before Susan K. McGuire, CSR, RPR. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>Page 5</p> <p>1 WHEREUPON, 2 JOHN H. PFAHL 3 after having been first duly sworn, deposes and says 4 in reply to the questions propounded as follows, 5 to-wit: 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. McCLANAHAN: 8 <b>Q. All right. I'll ask the witness to state 9 his name and spell it for the court reporter.</b> 10 A. Sure. My name is John Holland Pfahl. 11 That's J-O-H-N, H-O-L-L-A-N-D, P-F-A-H-L. 12 THE COURT REPORTER: I need him to speak up. 13 <b>Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) And if you could 14 possibly either turn your microphone up, or you speak 15 up. It's just a little difficult for us to hear when 16 you are talking.</b> 17 A. Yeah. Give me one second. I -- we're using 18 the conference room audio system, so I've got to go 19 over there to turn the settings on the microphone. 20 <b>Q. Okay. Okay. Sure.</b> 21 VIDEOGRAPHER: Do you want to take a break? 22 MS. McCLANAHAN: No. 23 VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. 24 THE WITNESS: Okay. It looks like the 25 microphone in the room is maxed out, so I'll just try</p>

1 A. Yes, that is correct.  
 2 **Q. And you think that's a fair estimate of the**  
 3 **density of limestone in this area, generally; is that**  
 4 **correct?**  
 5 A. Yes, I do.  
 6 **Q. Does density have anything to do with the**  
 7 **decision to blast or not blast in order to excavate?**  
 8 A. No, it does not.  
 9 **Q. To convert 63,180 cubic yards to tons, you**  
 10 **first multiplied 155 pounds per cubic foot by 27; is**  
 11 **that right?**  
 12 A. No. You would have divided it by 27. Or,  
 13 sorry, pounds per -- sorry. So, you first divide  
 14 it -- I would have to actually write this out, this  
 15 equation, to go from a pounds per cubic foot to tons  
 16 per cubic yard. My apologies there. If you'd like, I  
 17 can think about it for a second and give you the full  
 18 way of approaching it.  
 19 **Q. Okay. So, did you conclude that there were**  
 20 **264,000 -- or, I'm sorry, 264 million pounds of**  
 21 **limestone?**  
 22 A. I don't have the value or the volume --  
 23 sorry, the mass in pounds. I have it in tons. So I  
 24 converted the 155 pounds per cubic feet to 2.1 tons  
 25 per cubic yard, and applying that against the 63,180

1 cubic yards, came up with a paid value of 132,678 tons  
 2 of limestone.  
 3 **Q. Okay. Okay. I think -- we both got there.**  
 4 **My 264 million were divided then by 2,000 to get to**  
 5 **tons, and that's the same answer that you have,**  
 6 **132,678 tons; correct?**  
 7 A. Yeah, I'll have to take your word on that.  
 8 Again, I don't have the calculation and all the  
 9 interim steps in front of me, but if we're getting to  
 10 the same point, that sounds like the right answer.  
 11 **Q. Okay. And it's your opinion that the total**  
 12 **value of the 132,678 tons of limestone that was**  
 13 **excavated would be \$68,993. And I'm excluding**  
 14 **interest right now.**  
 15 A. So, yes, \$68,993, valued at the time that it  
 16 was mined.  
 17 **Q. And you base this value off the royalty rate**  
 18 **that's contained in a limestone lease to APAC Central**  
 19 **Quarry; is that right?**  
 20 A. That's right. I checked the leases on a  
 21 couple of the quarries on the OMC's mineral estate,  
 22 and they were consistent with that value. So that was  
 23 the value at the time for limestone being mined within  
 24 the county based on those leases.  
 25 **Q. Okay. I think attached to your report as**

1 **Exhibit 21 is a tribal resolution regarding the APAC**  
 2 **lease. I'm going to ask that that be marked and**  
 3 **entered as Exhibit -- Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 here.**  
 4 **Do you have that document in front of you?**  
 5 A. Exhibit 21?  
 6 **Q. It's attached to your report as Exhibit 21,**  
 7 **yes.**  
 8 A. Yes, I do have it.  
 9 **Q. And is this one of the documents you relied**  
 10 **upon to establish that .50 cents per ton of limestone**  
 11 **in 2012?**  
 12 A. Yes, that is correct.  
 13 **Q. Okay. So given that the limestone in**  
 14 **question that we're talking about in this case was**  
 15 **excavated in 2014, it's your opinion that the value of**  
 16 **the limestone that was taken by Osage Wind from the**  
 17 **estate during construction was .52 cents a ton; is**  
 18 **that correct?**  
 19 MR. RAY: Object to the form. You can  
 20 answer.  
 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that is correct. So the  
 22 royalties were escalated at that time. Again, I  
 23 looked at other leases as well, and they had a .1 cent  
 24 per year escalation. So the .50 cents in 2012  
 25 escalated to .52 cents in 2014.

1 **Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) So, in this regard, you**  
 2 **believe that the value of a lease from the OMC, as**  
 3 **contemplated by the Tenth Circuit, would have been**  
 4 **\$68,993, and, again, we're not talking about interest**  
 5 **right now; is that correct?**  
 6 MR. RAY: Object to the form.  
 7 THE WITNESS: So, yeah. My opinion, the  
 8 value of the mineral mined to the OMC would have been  
 9 \$68,993 at the time.  
 10 **Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) Okay. So limestone was**  
 11 **not the only mineral that was excavated during the**  
 12 **construction; is that right?**  
 13 A. That is correct.  
 14 **Q. Do you agree that other minerals were**  
 15 **excavated?**  
 16 A. I agree that other minerals were excavated.  
 17 **Q. Clay and shale were also excavated during**  
 18 **the construction; is that correct?**  
 19 A. Yes, that is correct.  
 20 **Q. And do you agree that clay and shale are**  
 21 **considered mineral resources?**  
 22 A. I do not believe that clay and shale meet  
 23 the definition of being mined. It was outlaid by the  
 24 Tenth Circuit court.  
 25 **Q. Okay. But that wasn't my question. Do you**

<p>Page 34</p> <p>1 copper, lead, zinc, coal, and asphaltum, the lessee</p> <p>2 shall pay quarterly a royalty of 10 percent of the</p> <p>3 value at the nearest shipping point of all ores,</p> <p>4 metals, or minerals marketed.</p> <p>5 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, I believe so.</p> <p>7 Q. So could clay and shale be considered</p> <p>8 minerals, other than gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc,</p> <p>9 coal and asphaltum?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p> <p>12 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) Do you know if -- when</p> <p>13 someone enters a lease with the Osage Minerals Council</p> <p>14 to mine clay or shale from the mineral estate, do you</p> <p>15 know whether or not this regulation applies?</p> <p>16 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I do not know how the OMC</p> <p>18 takes into account this regulation when they set their</p> <p>19 leases. It's clear that they didn't follow it 100</p> <p>20 percent, because the limestone leases that they set at</p> <p>21 the time do not use the 10 percent royalty. So I</p> <p>22 don't know where else they diverge from this.</p> <p>23 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) So we're -- again,</p> <p>24 we're having a little bit of trouble understanding</p> <p>25 you, if you could, maybe, put your hands down and just</p>	<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 have been important for your opinion, in forming an</p> <p>2 opinion in this case, to know whether or not this</p> <p>3 regulation applies?</p> <p>4 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I think what is most important</p> <p>6 is what the actual market rates were at the time, and</p> <p>7 what was established. Those seem to divert from this.</p> <p>8 So, I defer to what was actually being done instead of</p> <p>9 this regulation. I'm sorry, just to --</p> <p>10 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) And if I understand --</p> <p>11 I'm sorry, go ahead.</p> <p>12 A. Is the SOUND any better now?</p> <p>13 Q. It's a little better. Our --</p> <p>14 MS. McCLANAHAN: Let me just ask, are we</p> <p>15 completely turned up so far as volume?</p> <p>16 MS. HAMMOCK: Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) Okay. We're as far up</p> <p>18 as we can get, so I appreciate you speaking loudly, I</p> <p>19 guess.</p> <p>20 So it's your opinion that clay and shale</p> <p>21 that was excavated from the Osage mineral estate by</p> <p>22 Osage Wind had no value because there was no</p> <p>23 processing facility to make them valuable; is that</p> <p>24 right?</p> <p>25 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p>
<p>Page 35</p> <p>1 speak as loud as you can.</p> <p>2 I believe the upshot of what you just said</p> <p>3 was that you don't believe that they followed this</p> <p>4 regulation?</p> <p>5 A. What I said is that it's -- the limestone</p> <p>6 leases -- I'm sorry, I'm going to scoot over one</p> <p>7 chair.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. Just so that I'm closer to the microphone.</p> <p>10 Maybe that will make a difference.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay.</p> <p>12 A. So what I just said is that the limestone</p> <p>13 leases that I reviewed that I have formed the basis of</p> <p>14 my .52 cents per ton to set the value of the limestone</p> <p>15 were not a 10 percent of value type lease. So I do</p> <p>16 not know what else the OMC does that diverges or is</p> <p>17 not consistent with this regulation.</p> <p>18 Q. Do you have any reason to disagree that</p> <p>19 214.10(d) would apply if someone sought to mine clay</p> <p>20 and shale from the mineral estate here?</p> <p>21 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: As noted, the OMC did not</p> <p>23 appear to follow it, so there probably was good reason</p> <p>24 for that.</p> <p>25 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) Do you think it would</p>	<p>Page 36</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: So the value of a mineral is</p> <p>2 only when you can sell it. And if they were able to</p> <p>3 sell the clay or shale for other purposes, then it</p> <p>4 could have had value. But from the standpoint of a</p> <p>5 material amount of volume, in my opinion there is not</p> <p>6 a market for clay and shale that is extensive enough</p> <p>7 to drive those as an important point of value.</p> <p>8 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) But you understand, as</p> <p>9 you read 214.10(d), that that regulation does not</p> <p>10 value minerals according to whether there is nearby</p> <p>11 demand or nearby processing; correct?</p> <p>12 MR. RAY: Object to the form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: No, you're actually incorrect.</p> <p>14 That regulation values minerals when they're sold. If</p> <p>15 there is no nearby processing, or there is no nearby</p> <p>16 marketing and they are not sold, then they carry zero</p> <p>17 value.</p> <p>18 Q. (BY MS. McCLANAHAN) Well, you would agree</p> <p>19 that the operative word, I guess, that we're both</p> <p>20 looking at is the word "nearest"?</p> <p>21 A. No. The operative word here is "market."</p> <p>22 So the mineral is only worth what you can sell it for.</p> <p>23 If you cannot sell that mineral, then it's worth zero.</p> <p>24 Q. Well, the regulation reads, For substances</p> <p>25 other than, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, coal,</p>